

Ref #	Hits	Search Query	DBs	Default Operator	Plurals	Time Stamp
S1	4069	tank and (cover or lid) and pump and conical and conduit	US-PGPUB; USPAT; USOCR	AND	ON	2005/07/28 13:56
S2	1722	tank and ((cover or lid) same (hinge or open)) and pump and conical and conduit	US-PGPUB; USPAT; USOCR	AND	ON	2005/07/28 14:02
S3	114	tank and ((cover or lid) same (hinge or open)) and pump and conical and conduit	US-PGPUB	AND	ON	2005/07/29 09:55
S4	514	tank and ((cover or lid) same (hinge or open)) and pump and conical and conduit	USPAT	AND	ON	2005/07/28 14:02
S5	1094	tank and ((cover or lid) same (hinge or open)) and pump and conical and conduit	USOCR	AND	ON	2005/07/28 14:02
S6	877	tank and ((cover or lid) same (hinge or open)) and pump and conical and conduit and outlet	USOCR	AND	ON	2005/07/28 14:03
S7	1369	tank and ((cover or lid) same (hinge or open)) and pump and conical and conduit and outlet	US-PGPUB; USPAT; USOCR	AND	ON	2005/07/28 14:04
S8	0	tank and ((cover or lid) same (hinge or open)) and "diaphragm pump" and conical and conduit and outlet	US-PGPUB; USPAT; USOCR	AND	ON	2005/07/28 14:04
S9	30	tank and ((cover or lid) same (hinge or open)) and "diaphragm pump" and conical and conduit and outlet	US-PGPUB; USPAT; USOCR	AND	ON	2005/07/28 14:06
S10	10	(vessel) and ((cover or lid) same (hinge or open)) and "diaphragm pump" and conical and conduit and outlet	US-PGPUB; USPAT; USOCR	AND	ON	2005/07/28 14:07
S11	622	(vessel) and ((cover or lid) same (hinge or open)) and "pump" and conical and conduit and outlet	US-PGPUB; USPAT; USOCR	AND	ON	2005/07/28 14:08
S12	378	(vessel) and ((cover or lid) same (hinge or open)) and "pump" and conical and conduit and (outlet same bottom)	US-PGPUB; USPAT; USOCR	AND	ON	2005/07/28 14:08
S13	1075	(vessel or tank) and ((cover or lid) same (hinge or open)) and "pump" and conical and conduit and (outlet same bottom)	US-PGPUB; USPAT; USOCR	AND	ON	2005/07/28 14:09

S14	799	(vessel or tank) and ((cover or lid) same (hinge or open)) and "pump" and (conical same bottom) and conduit and (outlet same bottom)	US-PGPUB; USPAT; USOCR	AND	ON	2005/07/28 14:09
S15	5	("3212759").URPN.	USPAT	AND	ON	2005/07/28 15:35
S16	238	366/173.2.ccls.	USPAT	AND	ON	2005/07/28 15:39
S17	214	366/167.1.ccls.	USPAT	AND	ON	2005/07/28 16:02
S18	169	366/182.2.ccls.	USPAT	AND	ON	2005/07/28 16:12
S19	92	366/190.ccls.	USPAT	AND	ON	2005/07/28 16:25
S20	214	366/40.ccls.	USPAT	AND	ON	2005/07/29 09:30
S21	107	366/10.ccls.	USPAT	AND	ON	2005/07/29 09:22
S22	126	366/3.ccls.	USPAT	AND	ON	2005/07/29 09:24
S23	72	366/34.ccls.	USPAT	AND	ON	2005/07/29 09:39
S24	83	366/30.ccls.	USPAT	AND	ON	2005/07/29 09:48
S26	113	239/594.ccls.	US-PGPUB; USPAT; USOCR	AND	ON	2005/07/29 09:54
S27	179	239/592.ccls.	US-PGPUB; USPAT	AND	ON	2005/07/29 09:54
S28	108	tank and ((cover or lid) same (inlet)) and pump and conical and conduit	US-PGPUB	AND	ON	2005/07/29 09:57
S29	531	tank and ((cover or lid) same (inlet)) and pump and conical and conduit	USPAT	AND	ON	2005/07/29 09:58
S30	131	tank and ((cover or lid) near5 (inlet)) and pump and conical and conduit	USPAT	AND	ON	2005/07/29 10:05
S31	79	tank and ((cover or lid) near5 (inlet)) and pump and conical and conduit	USOCR	AND	ON	2005/07/29 10:05

Sooahoo, Tony

From: patnews@ns1.patenting-art.com
Sent: Friday, July 29, 2005 2:56 PM
Subject: PATNEWS: More PTO employees arrested? Problems with PTO elevators?

!20050729 More PTO employees arrested? Problems with PTO elevators?

I just can't make this stuff up.

- Article on low morale at the PTO
- Congress delays further consideration of patent reform until fall
- USPTO Weekly reports on more arrests at the PTO
- PTO management eliminating Big Brother elevator control system
- Corporate-type patent lawyer testifies about PTO management
- What does Todd Dickinson mean about patent quality?

Greg Aharonian
Internet Patent News Service

=====

- ARTICLE ON LOW MORALE AT THE PTO

The online version of Federal Computer Week, 25 July 2005, has an article about the low morale at the USPTO by one of their reporters, Florence Olson. The URL is: <http://www.fcw.com/article89658-07-25-05-Print>

She quotes the examiners union's president, Ron Stern:

"I don't think I've ever seen a time when, in a concentrated two- or three-week period, I've heard about as many people either having left or planning to leave as I have now."

=====

- CONGRESS DELAYS FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF PATENT REFORM UNTIL FALL

Newswires reported that U.S. House of Representatives is delaying further work on its version of patent reform until after Labor Day. I am being cynical in thinking that some in Congress are thinking that there is still enough bickering amongst industry groups that they can drag this out until the end of the year, throw it into next year's activities, giving them a chance for more lobbying dollars.

=====

[Note: the latest gossip from the USPTO Weekly, which by the way, PTO management should release to the public. Do I have to file a lawsuit so the public can have access to this vital information about examiners' working conditions?]

-- USPTO WEEKLY REPORTS ON MORE ARRESTS AT THE PTO

From: USPTO Weekly
Sent: Thursday, July 28, 2005 9:14 AM
Subject: USPTO Weekly Extra - July 28, 2005 -

Information on Recent Arrests at USPTO Facilities

Recently, a small number of USPTO employees have been arrested while

at work. The arrests have raised a lot of questions from employees, especially with regard to the use of handcuffs by law-enforcement officials. This message is intended to give you the results of our inquiries to law-enforcement officials.

Who Made the Arrests?

Who made the arrest depends on the nature of the alleged crime. City of Alexandria police have arrested employees with outstanding criminal warrants for activities unrelated to the USPTO. They have also arrested employees accused of defrauding the government by the Department of Commerce's Office of the Inspector General (OIG). The Federal Protective Service arrested those accused of theft from USPTO employees.

No USPTO employee has made an arrest. Representatives from USPTO's Office of Security are alerted that an arrest will take place just as the law-enforcement officials arrive at our buildings. A representative from USPTO's Office of Security typically accompanies the officers.

Why Have Some USPTO Employees Been Arrested?

The arrests have been based on a variety of criminal charges. A few arrests have been for "defrauding the government," in cases involving huge amounts of timesheet fraud. [The OIG has the authority to investigate fraud, and to recommend disciplinary actions. USPTO is required to cooperate if the OIG determines that a case warrants referral to law-enforcement officials.] Others have been for criminal activities completely unrelated to the USPTO. Some have been for other types of theft, including stealing money from USPTO employees' work areas.

Why Have USPTO Employees Accused of a Crime Been Handcuffed?

The law-enforcement agencies making the arrest decide what arrest procedures to use. If they decide to handcuff an employee, the USPTO cannot stop them. We are told that law enforcement officials who have used handcuffs are following standard procedure.

Why Have USPTO Employees Accused of a Crime Been Arrested at Work?

Again, law-enforcement agencies decide where to make arrests. Evidently, for criminal charges stemming from alleged wrongdoing at work, the workplace has been the venue for arrest. For criminal charges stemming from alleged wrongdoing outside the Office, some law enforcement officials have made a decision to arrest USPTO employees at work.

What Should You Do?

Arrests do not mean a person is guilty. Handcuffing is dramatic - - but is a typical law-enforcement procedure. As co-workers, we should cooperate with law-enforcement officials, but not jump to any conclusions about a colleague who has been arrested.

=====

- PTO MANAGEMENT ELIMINATING BIG BROTHER ELEVATOR CONTROL SYSTEM

From: Locker, Howard
Sent: Thursday, June 30, 2005 4:22 PM
Subject: FW: Elevators

Please email this to bargaining unit members in your TCs:

For those of you who have been experiencing the pain of having to use the freight elevators in the early mornings and weekends, or have otherwise had to deal with problematic/nonfunctioning elevators, it looks as though

things may be getting at least a bit better in the near future.

According to the Agency's Health, Safety and Security team - beginning on Wednesday, July 6, the elevators will run freely between 5:30 a.m. and 10:00 p.m. Monday through Friday - that is, they will not require the use of a smart card to activate. During the weekends and between 10 p.m. and 5:30 a.m. M-F, you will need to use your smart card in order for the elevators to take you up to your floor.

Additionally, beginning on July 6, outside doors to the buildings will not require use of the smart card from 5:30 a.m. to 10:00 p.m. Monday through Friday.

We are continuing to work on the the Agency to remove the elevator badging altogether, as well as on the turnstile issue per se.

=====

- CORPORATE-TYPE PATENT LAWYER TESTIFIES ABOUT PTO MANAGEMENT

On July 26th, Christine Siwik, a lawyer with Rakoczy Molino Mazzochi Siwik, and outside counsel to Barr Laboratories (a generics company), testified before the Senate Judiciary Committee hearing on patent reform. Some of her comments:

Any effort to improve patent quality should start at the PTO. ... While patent examiners do doubt strive to issue patents only on those applications satisfying the statutory criteria for patentability, some aspects of PTO policy and procedure foster the issuance of patents irrespective of quality. ... Finally, until the issues within the PTO are adequately addressed, Congress should approach any sweeping changes to the Patent Act carefully, ...

Nice, a good start, but let's see more mentions of PTO management. She goes on to criticize various aspects of the patent reform bill:

- that H.R. 2795 makes it easier to obtain and maintain suspect and overbroad patents
- the bill would establish a nearly impossible-to-meet standard for proving a violation of the duty of candor
- relaxing the best mode requirement will not improve patent quality
- the bill could severely relax other patentability requirements
- the anti-consumer consequences of H.R. 2795 result from several different aspects of the proposed revisions to section 102
- by eliminating the requirement that patentees and applicants act in good faith, H.R. 2795 will not improve patent quality

By the way, whatever they are smoking or drinking at IPO, send me some, so I can enter another reality where "IPO supports a large majority of the bill's provisions, many of which appear to be without controversy" - only if you are in a purple haze. Then again, IPO would be more productive if it spent time trying to kiss the sky.

=====

- WHAT DOES TODD DICKINSON MEAN ABOUT PATENT QUALITY?

Also speaking on the 26th to the Senate about patent reform was Todd Dickinson, former PTO Commissioner and now Chief IP Counsel for General.

Electric. From such a secure and powerful position (unlike the rest of us), Todd's testimony about PTO management and patent quality was, shall I say, ah, Todd, next time can you say something about PTO management?

As all polished speakers do, he started out with a joke to relax the audience. "The [FTC and NAS patent reform] reports were thorough, well-thought out, and".

He gets in a good criticism of Congress stealing PTO fees and why they should forever stop doing so. He goes on for a few pages about harmonization, first-to-file and the grace period. He's not thrilled with the "second window" for post-grant review, and seems to share the concern with many the getting rid of injunctions is a bad idea. He also seems to agree that the proposed duty-of-candor stuff is "less likely to lead to compliance with the duty of candor".

But especially in light of the two recent GAO reports, it is sad that he does not mention problems with PTO management. After all, most of the proposed reforms will be implemented by ... that's right ... PTO management in conjunction with PTO examiners. What guarantees they won't mismanage these new responsibilities? It is a recipe for achieving no change. Kind of like talking about the Iraqi government without mentioning how much the Sunni and Shia politicians hate each other.

But there is one comment that I would strongly disagree with if I knew what he was referring to. He states:

"In my experience, the USPTO does a very effective job. I have strong confidence in the strength and validity of the vast majority of issued patents."

Vast majority are strong and valid? When the majority of issued patents cite no non-patent prior art? Where when better scrutinized (double eyeballs), the majority of patent applications are denied? When in some areas of patents, like software patents, the general perception is, at a minimum, the majority of issued independent claims are invalid? When many patents can be busted by Google searchers? Where patent examiners are using PATNEWS to bust patents? Where's the statistical data for this assertion? Did GE do a study, say, take a few hundred patents, spend a ton on money on searchers and litigators, to see just how valid the issued patents are?

Letting Congress remain clueless about the problems with patent quality is a horrible start to improving patent quality. Not that it has occurred to Congress to ever ask anyone testifying to back up their assertions.